

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

#### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Indicator 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Measurement:

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services}) \div (\# \text{ of children exiting Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred}) \div (\# \text{ of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred}) \div (\# \text{ of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>FFY 2006</b> <i>(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)</i>	<b>100%</b>

#### Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

##### ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

Indicator 8a: - 97.5% (2,737 out of 2,808) of all children exiting Part C have an IFSP with transition steps and services.

##### REVISION

**Indicator 8a: - 96.6% (13,621 out of 14,099) of all children discharged during fiscal year 2007 had a completed transition plan on the IFSP.**

The Annual Report/Self-Assessment collected information for LEA-referred discharged children on whether they had an individualized transition plan on the IFSP. This information was compared to Massachusetts' EI data system (EIS) on all discharged IFSP children to ensure the reliability of EIS data in capturing data on children having a "fully developed transition plan". The data for this question on the Annual Report/Self-Assessment for 2,808 discharged children follows:

2,677 (95.3%) stated the same response on both the Annual Report/Self - Assessment and EIIS  
 66 ( 2.4%) stated different responses on the Annual Report/Self - Assessment and EIIS  
 65 ( 2.3%) had an unknown response on either the Annual Report/Self - Assessment or in EIIS  
 =====  
 2,808 (100%)

Given that 95.3% stated the same response on both data sets the EIIS data was used for responding to this section of the indicator. The results follow:

11,521 (81.7%) Yes  
 2,100 (14.9%) No, but acceptable reason  
 478 ( 3.4%) No  
 =====  
 14,099 (100%)

**96.6%** of IFSP children discharged during fiscal year 2007 had a completed transition plan on the IFSP.

The reasons for responses that stated "No" but had a justifiable reason included the following:

- Abrupt discontinuation of service
- Family situation (e.g., moved)
- Unable or difficult contacting the family
- Family refused or discontinued services

Reason for slippage: Massachusetts' percentage of 98.3% for last year was based only on LEA - referred children on data received from the Annual Report/Self -Assessment. This data set is perceived by providers to be tied more closely to program performance and, therefore, the inclusion of justification reasons is better documented within this data set. Massachusetts believes that the percentage of children having a completed transition plan on the IFSP is higher than what is stated in EIIS due to the misconception of what a "fully developed" transition plan entails for children under 24 months of age. Many responses in EIIS stated "No" with a justification being "young child" or "child is only 18 months". Massachusetts believes that these children more than likely had an individualized transition plan that was appropriate for the child at their age. These responses, however, remained "No" under this indicator. **See SPP/APR Indicator 8 Transition Grid below.**

#### **ORIGINAL SUBMISSION**

Indicator 8b: - 95% (2,669 out of 2,808) of all children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred.

#### **REVISION**

**Indicator 8b: - 94.7% (2,660 out of 2,808)** of all children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred. Based on feedback from OSEP the state may not exclude children who were referred for EI services after 33 months in their calculation. This revision resulted in 10 children being moved out of the "No, but OK" category and into the "No" category. The state percentage of 94.7% continues to be higher than last year's percent of 80.4%.

#### **ORIGINAL SUBMISSION**

Indicator 8c: - 98.4% (2,762 out of 2,808) of all children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where a transition planning conference occurred.

## REVISION

Indicator 8c: - 98.4% (2,762 out of 2,808) of all children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where a transition planning conference occurred. OSEP's calculation of these data using the correct measurement is 88.5%. However, further follow up by Lead agency staff with local EIPs regarding the 277 (9.9%) of Transition Planning Conferences that occurred but were outside the 90 day timeline were due to the family choice to hold the meeting when the LEA could attend and participate in the meeting thus resulting in the meeting being held outside of the timeframe. The Lead Agency will continue to provide guidance to local EIPs on holding Transition Planning Conference with the 90 day timeframe and accurately reporting family circumstances.

### SPP/APR INDICATOR 8: Transition FFY 2006/FY 2007

Data source: 618 data, Table 3 (Exiting) for FY 2006 - Only children discharged and referred to an LEA

The following children were excluded from Table 3 (Exiting):

- o Children having an IFSP but never received ongoing IFSP services
- o Children under the age of three
- o Children not referred to an LEA

## ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

### THIS YEAR (FY 2007)

Category	8a		8b		8c	
	Completed Tran Plan		LEA Notified*		TPC Occurred	
	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids
Yes	2,583	92.0%	2,469	87.9%	1,519	54.1%
Yes, but outside timeframe					277	9.9%
No, but acceptable reason	154	5.5%	200	7.1%	966	34.4%
No	71	2.5%	139	5.0%	46	1.6%
Total	2,808	100.0%	2,808	100.0%	2,808	100.0%

\*49.8% of children served in the Boston EI programs had a LEA notification sent

Total compliant	2,737	97.5%	2,669	95.0%	2,762	98.4%
-----------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

## REVISION

### THIS YEAR (FY07)

Category	8a		8b		8c	
	Completed Tran Plan		LEA Notified*		TPC Occurred	
	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids
Yes	11,521	81.7%	2,469	87.9%	1,519	54.1%
Yes, but outside timeframe					277	9.9%
No, but acceptable reason	2,100	14.9%	191	6.8%	966	34.4%
No	478	3.4%	148	5.3%	46	1.6%
Total	14,099	100.0%	2,808	100.0%	2,808	100.0%

\*49.8% of children served in the Boston EI programs had a LEA notification sent

Total compliant	13,621	96.6%	2,660	94.7%	2,762	98.4%
-----------------	--------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

### Yes, but outside timeframe

Category	# Kids	% Kids
within 1 week of compliancy timeframe	59	21.3%
within 2 to 3 weeks of compliancy timeframe	72	26.0%
within 4 to 6 weeks of compliancy timeframe	80	28.9%
> 6 weeks outside of compliancy timeframe	66	23.8%
Total	277	100.0%

### LAST YEAR (FY 2006)

Category	8a		8b		8c	
	Completed Tran Plan		LEA Notified*		TPC Occurred	
	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids	# Kids	% Kids
Yes	3,211	96.3%	2,441	73.2%	2,835	85.0%
No, but acceptable reason	67	2.0%	239	7.2%	422	12.7%
No	57	1.7%	655	19.6%	78	2.3%
Total	3,335	100.0%	3,335	100.0%	3,335	100.0%

\*49.8% of children served in the Boston EI programs had a LEA notification sent

Total compliant

3,278 98.3% 2,680 80.4% 3,257 97.7%

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The Lead Agency once again used data collected from the Transition Survey of the FY 2007 Annual Report/Self Assessment, based on children discharged and referred to an LEA. The transition information captured in the Annual Report/Self Assessment has enabled the Lead Agency to accurately capture Part C transition requirements and local program performance on this Indicator. The Lead Agency provided additional clarity and guidance to providers regarding Part C transition requirements to ensure complete and comprehensive transition plans, LEA notification and Transition Planning Conferences.

The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) in collaboration with the Lead Agency the Massachusetts Department of Public Health held two Transition Workshops in April 2007 to review Part C and Part B/Section 619 Pre-School Special Education requirements and improve transitions.

In September 2007, the DPH and EEC completed and disseminated a guide to transition, co-authored by the DPH and EEC, written for parents, early childhood educators, LEAs and EIPs. **See Attachment C, Best Practices in Early Childhood Transition: A Guide for Families.** Each EIP and school district received on hard copy of the guide and the PDF file to make copies and disseminate to staff and families. Over the next year DPH and EEC will offer joint training and technical assistance to EIPs and LEAs to support transition work. In addition, a breakout session on implementing smooth transitions was held at the ICC Retreat in October, 2007.

### **8a) IFSPs with Transition Steps and Services**

The Lead Agency revised the Universal IFSP Transition Page to reflect the required transition activities to ensure a successful transition from Part C to next step service. **See Attachment D Universal IFSP January 2008, pages 7a and b.**

The Transition Plan of the IFSP has been expanded to three pages to include a review of options for families; information for parents regarding the process of transition; support available to parents; and information to be sent to the LEA and/or other community providers. The plan outlines activities and tasks to be performed by both the family and Early Intervention staff to ensure a smooth transition. Local Early Intervention programs are required to complete pages 7a for all children regardless of age or the child's potential eligibility for Part B. The EIS discharge form as well as the Transition Survey of the Annual Report/Self Assessment captures whether fully developed Transition Plans to prepare the child and family for next step services are in place at the time of discharge.

The Actual Target data for FFY 2006 of **97.5% (2,737 out of 2,808)** of all children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services illustrates a slight decrease from 98.3% reflected in the FFY 2005 APR, to come into full compliance with the Indicator. Some of the reasons stated for not having a complete transition plan in place included the following: family situation (moved); lost contact with the family; difficulty contacting the family; family discontinued services; and data errors. The introduction of the revised Transition plan of the IFSP will better capture the reasons why a complete transition plan was not in place with the addition of the question – Transition plan was not completed for the following reason(s). In addition, the Transition Survey in the FY 2008 Annual Report/Self Assessment will include a drop down menu for reasons why a transition plan was not completed.

### **Focused Monitoring**

Transition continues to be one of the key priority areas in the Focused Monitoring process. Complete and comprehensive transition plans are monitored through onsite file review protocols.

In FFY 2005 there were two Findings identified through Focused Monitoring onsite visits regarding complete and comprehensive Transition Plans. Programs with Findings were notified in April 2006 and June 2006, and corrective action plans were developed with the Lead Agency. Technical assistance was provided by the Lead Agency in the form of training highlighting federal and state transition requirements, and correction of noncompliance was verified through onsite file reviews.

The Lead Agency publicly reported on Indicator 8a in July 2007. In addition, local program reports were disseminated to each EIP highlighting program performance on the percent of children exiting Part C with IFSPs with transition steps and services.

### **8b) LEA Notification for children potentially eligible for Part B**

The Actual target data, for FFY 2006 of **95% (2,669 out of 2,808)** of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where LEA notification occurred demonstrates significant improvement and progress in this Indicator. As noted above, the Lead Agency provided extensive information and training on federal transition requirements specifically regarding LEA notification and "opt out". Regional training and guidance was provided in November and December 2006. Additionally, a conference call was sponsored by the Lead Agency in May 2007 to provide additional clarity and respond to questions from providers. The Universal IFSP Transition Plan has been revised to capture the Date of Notification to the Local Education Agency (LEA), and parental "opt out". See page 7b of Attachment D

Documented reasons for why the LEA was not notified of children potentially eligible for Part B include the following; family did not want LEA referral; child determined age appropriate; and late referral to EI (after 33 months).

Regional Lead Agency staff will follow up with those local programs where LEA notification did not consistently occur. Targeted technical assistance has occurred with the Early Intervention Programs

in the Boston region, and policies and procedures have been implemented to ensure LEA notification of children potentially eligible for Part B services occurs on a consistent basis.

### **Focused Monitoring**

Transition continues to be a key priority area in the Focused Monitoring process. LEA Notification is monitored through onsite file review protocols.

The Lead Agency publicly reported on Indicator 8b in July 2007. In addition, local program reports were disseminated to each EIP highlighting program performance on the percent of children exiting Part C where LEA Notification occurred.

### **8c) Transition Planning Conferences**

The Actual target data for FFY2006 of **98.4% (2,762 out of 2,808)** of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where transition planning conferences occurred demonstrates continued improvement and progress in this Indicator. Progress is attributed to ongoing training and technical assistance provided by the Lead Agency regarding Transition Planning Conferences. The Early Intervention Operational Standards define Transition Planning Conference as “***The required meeting that is held with a child and/or his/her family, and documented on the Transition Page of the IFSP, at least 90 days and up to 9 months prior to the child’s third birthday. The purpose of the conference is to inform the family about all possible transition options and to prep are the family for termination of EI services.***” The Massachusetts EI system requires a Transition Planning Conference on all children exiting Part C. The Lead Agency only reported data on those children potentially eligible for Part B for Indicator 8c.

Documented reasons of exceptional family circumstances for the 966 children and families where a Transition Planning Conference did not occur included the following; family schedule, LEA schedule, parent declined meeting; family moved; family requested delay; and family waived meeting.

277 (9.9%) of Transition Planning Conferences that occurred but were outside the 90 day timeline were due to complications or scheduling issues with LEAs. Early Intervention Programs make every effort to invite and notify the LEA of the Transition Planning Conference, but in many instances the LEA can not attend due to lack of personnel and resources. EIPs are required to convene the TPC even if LEA participation does not occur.

### **Focused Monitoring**

Transition continues to be a key priority area in the Focused Monitoring process. Transition Planning Conferences are monitored through onsite file review protocols. There was one Finding in FFY 2005 identified through the Focused Monitoring process regarding Transition conferences on all children potentially eligible for Part B. The program was notified in June 2006 and a corrective action plan was developed with Lead Agency staff. Technical assistance was provided by Lead Agency staff regarding federal transition requirements and the program implemented policies and procedures to ensure that Transition conference are documented on the Transition Plan of the IFSP.

The Lead Agency publicly reported on Indicator 8c in July 2007. In addition, local program reports were disseminated to each EIP highlighting program performance on the percent of children exiting Part C where transition planning conference occurred.

In FFY 2006 there were 3 Findings of noncompliance related to this Indicator. Two were identified through the Focused Monitoring process and one was identified based on a Formal written complaint regarding the failure to comply with transition requirements for a child transitioning from one EIP to another. Corrective actions plans were requested and programs were required to implement appropriate transition policies and procedures. Timely correction of noncompliance will be addressed in the FFY 2007 APR submission.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:**

**Improvement Activities:**

The updated Interagency Transition Agreement between the DPH, Head Start, DOE, and EEC is completed and is currently being reviewed at the senior management level at DOE. Once finalized and disseminated this agreement will provide guidance to EIPs and local school districts on transition requirements and will promote timely transitions. DPH and EEC staff will provide additional guidance to providers regarding the Interagency Agreement.

**Timeline:** 2008

**Resource:** Lead Agency Staff/Part B 619 Coordinator

In response to OSEP's request Massachusetts has developed a Transition Policy (**See Attachment E**) that includes the Interagency Transition Agreement, opt-out provisions, and defines (Part B) "potentially eligible children". The Lead Agency has obtained stakeholder input and feedback on the Transition Policy and will obtain informal review from OSEP prior to the submission of the SPP/APR. The draft Transition Policy will also be submitted as part of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Year Part C Application for additional comment.

**Timeline:** January – May, 2008

**Resource:** Lead Agency Staff

Massachusetts Lead agency staff are currently collaborating with the Northeast and North Central Regional Resource Centers to develop an online Transition Training to support EI program staff in providing effective transition services to children who are exiting Part C and entering Part B special education services. The training will help personnel in recognizing the critical components of transition and in taking appropriate steps to support children and families in the process. The online training will be required of all new services coordinators working in the EI system. The Lead agency staff will partner with EEC to determine if the training will be required of Part B staff as well.

**Timeline:** FY 2008

**Resource:** Assistant Director Early Childhood Programs/CSPD Coordinator/619 Coordinator

***New improvement activities noted above are reflected in the Massachusetts Part C State Performance Plan.***